

www.better-management.org provides invaluable insights that will help you understand and deliver better organizational performance.

Better-Management Newsletter 1 November 2015

Scientists' scams / Growth based on hope and scientific BS / The oil-rich are frittering away their wealth

Scientists' scams

I worry about our propensity to do what scientists want us to do. Most aspire to save the world and to save us from ourselves – presumably because that is either what justifies their existence or what gets them more grant money. Whether we must stop using energy or eat a different diet, it seems to me to just be concatenated crap. I agree on this with Doug Casey...

<http://www.caseyresearch.com/articles/weekend-edition-doug-casey-on-the-nanny-state>

On oil versus renewable energy I have studied Amory Lovins' (Rocky Mountain Institute) views and find him to be rather optimistic and self-deluded. But he has a reason, he is a consultant on the subject and he has to make money somehow. On the same subject I entirely reject the thesis by Naomi Klein. I found her book without merit and also self-delusional. Her anti-corporate rants may have a place somewhere but not within her subject matter.

I am still on the fence over the cause/actuality of "global warming", but I am far more concerned that scientists think they can do something about it...particularly to counter the impact of the sun and humanity on weather. Introducing costs for NZ farmers when countries like Indonesia do this...

<http://www.msn.com/en-nz/news/world/how-indonesias-fire-crisis-became-one-of-the-worlds-biggest-climate-disasters/ar-BBmEQy6?li=AA59FU&ocid=EIE9HP>

..is just bizarre. Well, isn't it? Brazil is another culprit...and as for the Californian and North American fires?

Then there is India wanting somehow to increase growth dramatically – at a real but undisclosed cost to the atmosphere – how reasonable are they to expect us to agree with their lies about cutting CO2 emissions. Then there is China who will need to clean up their pollution while they produce more children and increase car usage (i.e. using the internal combustion engine) by 26 million cars per year. Sure China will introduce rapid technological change over the next 20 years. But if they do not expect robots to solve their labour shortages problems of the future, does the increase of family size from one child to two give you an idea of how successful they expect that will be. None of the emerging economies are providing credible targets because all they want is subsidy and a reduction of CO2 emissions from the OECD countries...their proposition is that they want to keep taking and we keep giving...

<http://www.economist.com/news/asia/21672359-prime-minister-wants-india-grow-fast-over-next-20-years-china-has-over-past-20>

I suspect that in the future robots plus energy will provide production growth, while more people will provide more consumption growth. So any proposed solutions that don't address population numbers to downscale our impact on the planet and its resources are just meaningless platitudes.

Even this surfer (below) knows that "nature bats last" which is why the surfer in this video stays in touch with his jet ski companion...getting caught inside by this monster is not an option...

<http://www.msn.com/en-nz/video/downtime/pro-surfer-smashes-one-of-the-biggest-waves-youll-ever-see/vi-BBmDEUW?ocid=EIE9HP>

Growth based on hope and scientific BS

Nor is it an option to think we can continue to grow – based on a mixture of hope and scientific BS.

There is a time when the hubris of scientists must be reined in. Yet every child getting interviewed on TV wants to grow up to be a "marine biologist" and every daddy says "wow, how nice". Dreams are free, but reality is what pays the bills.

"Global Warming" discussions are really only about redistribution of wealth and control because nothing else is practically achievable within the timescale we have before practically affordable oil starts running down. Then there will be insufficient money to do any expensive re-jigging. *(Editor's note: those with a cup-half-full mentality reckon technology will resolve most current issues such as energy shortages, but the transition period will probably be very traumatic.)*

The oil-rich are frittering away their wealth

If anyone thinks there is enough money to do the things required to wean us off oil, all we can do at this point is to print money and build debt. Those who once were wealthy have frittered it all away...

It isn't just the oil shale and tar sands producers that are suffering. Even OPEC/Russia is hurting to some degree...

No-one's economy is suffering more than Venezuela's...

<http://money.cnn.com/2015/10/29/news/economy/venezuela-selling-gold/index.html>

Then there is Russia...the smartest players under Putin, but...

Even Saudi Arabia is going to be taking a hit on any borrowing costs...

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-10-30/saudi-arabia-cut-to-a-from-aa-by-s-p-after-oil-prices-plunge>

The African producers are also hard hit, including Nigeria and Angola...

<http://qz.com/538237/ordinary-angolans-are-asking-where-did-all-the-oil-riches-go/>

The money from oil producers has already been taken away and distributed to consumers to persuade them to use more or drive further....

I would really like to see the emergence of the mythological EESU. There are others who pin their hopes on LENR or atomic fusion. But these are just other brands of hopium – like my own.

The real limits to growth will soon become more real and affect our daily lives.

Low oil prices will soon provide the cure for those same low oil prices and after escalating oil prices drive us out of deflation into a global inflationary spiral, governments will realise the targets set by other countries are just there as platitudes, while selfishness on a corporate, national and religious basis will continue to govern their real life decisions.

The heroes of our society are the folk who are trying to establish a reliable energy storage system to that provided by fossil fuels. The mechanics of capitalism allow them to develop their ideas without direction. Will they be successful? The jury is out on that.

This process of private enterprise driving technology has been one of humanity's successes. Yet those who are wanting to legislate for emissions trading systems are folk who tend to be employed by finance houses. Their aspirations point to monetarising a non-monetary problem, whereas that has never worked well. Hey, but it may help bank bonuses for a while longer? Some like Naomi Klein are socialists with a different agenda.

That probably gives an idea of how successful the authoritarian solutions are likely to be. Now let's see what stupidity comes from COP21 in Paris.